



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/020,022	12/06/2001	Thomas James Dubil	US 018198	8991
24737	7590	06/30/2005	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			BROWN, VERNAL U	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2635	

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/020,022

Applicant(s)

DUBIL ET AL

Examiner

Vernal U. Brown

Art Unit

2635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/14/05
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This action is responsive to amendment filed on March 21, 2005. 2005.

#### ***Response to Amendment***

The examiner has acknowledged the amended claims 1, 7, and 15.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

Regarding applicant's argument on page 8 regarding at least one of the means for transferring and a storage means of the charger, Averbuch et al. teaches a means (304) for transferring data (col. 4 lines 11-19) and a means (306) for storing data (col. 4 lines 20-25).

Regarding applicant's argument regarding the reference of Shanahan, the reference of Shanahan is used to teach the method of downloading data in which is selectively stored or is transferred to another device (col. 4 lines 30-45). Shanahan teaches the use of two devices (20) and (30) in the method of downloading a programming a device. Data is received from the source 50 and transferred to the programmable device 20 (col. 2 line 65-col. 3 line 5). Shanahan teaches the programmer route the data directly to the programmable device or may process the data into a suitable format (col. 3 lines 33-37) and the data is later retrieved by the programmable device from the programmer (col. 3 lines 37-40). The reference of Shanahan therefore teaches data is selectively stored or transferred directly to the programmable device.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1-3, 5,6, 7-15, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Averbuch et al. U.S Patent 5,689,825 in view of Shanahan US Patent 6,496,692.

Regarding claims 1 and 7, Averbuch et al. teaches a charger system comprising:  
a charger comprising coupling means for coupling to a rechargeable device (figure 1), wherein the coupling means includes charging means (108) for providing an electrical charge to the rechargeable device and means for transferring data to the rechargeable device (col. 2 lines 10-17); and means for receiving the data from a remote source and transferring the data upon receipt to at least one of the means for transferring and a storage means of the charger (col. 2 lines 20-22). Averbuch et al. is however silent on teaching selectively transferring data to the rechargeable device and the storage means of the charger. Shanahan in an art related method for programming information into an electronic device downloading data from a remote source and selectively storing data in the memory of the downloading device or transferring the data directly to be programmed in the device and the selective routing of data is performed by the processor (col. 4 lines 30-45) in order to facilitate any necessary processing of the downloaded data. Shanahan also teaches. The control of the routing of the data by the processor implies that the data is routed automatically.

Art Unit: 2635

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to selectively transfer data to the rechargeable device and the storage means of the charger in Averbuch et al. as evidenced by Shanahan because Averbuch et al. suggests a charger system for downloading data and transferring the data to a rechargeable device and Shanahan suggests downloading data from a remote source and selectively storing data in the memory of the downloading device or transferring the data directly to be programmed in the device in order to facilitate any necessary processing of the downloaded data.

Regarding claim 2, Averbuch et al. teaches the charging means provides an electrical charge to the rechargeable device and the means for transferring the data to the rechargeable device simultaneously (col. 2 line 65-col. 3 line 2) and (col. 6 lines 54-56).

Regarding claim 3, Averbuch et al. teaches receiving data from the remote source over the INTERNET (col. 5 lines 32-36).

Regarding claim 5, Averbuch et al. teaches downloading software to the portable device (col. 2 lines 10-12). Software programs inherently include executables.

Regarding claims 6 and 9, Averbuch et al. teaches downloading the software for operating the portable device (col. 2 lines 18-22). The downloaded software represents the operating instruction for the portable device and is considered schedule information because the software controls the operation of the portable device.

Regarding claim 8, Averbuch et al. teaches the remote source is a server (104) (col. 2 line 20) and initiating the transfer of data from the server (col. 2 lines 25-26).

Regarding claims 10-11, Averbuch et al. teaches the step of programming the charging device via the remote source (wireless portable device) to transmit the

Art Unit: 2635

request signal to the server by setting a flag in the wireless device (col. 4 lines 54-60) and using this flag to determine when to download the software. The wireless device is also the charging device (col. 2 line 67-col. 3 line 2).

Regarding claim 12, Averbuch et al. teaches notifying the remote source of the availability of the charging device for receiving the data by initiating the software download (col. 2 lines 25-26).

Regarding claims 13-15, Averbuch et al. teaches a method for providing data to a rechargeable electronic device comprising the steps of:

receiving data from a remote source via a charging device (col. 2 lines 10-16);

storing the received data within the charging device (col. 2 lines 26-28);

coupling the rechargeable electronic device to the charging device (col. 2 lines 15-18). Averbuch et al. further teaches charging the rechargeable electronic device and transferring the stored data and the received data from the charging device to the rechargeable electronic device (col. 2 lines 30-35). Averbuch et al. is however silent on teaching selectively transferring data to the rechargeable device and the storage means of the charger. Shanahan in an art related method for programming information into an electronic device downloading data from a remote source and selectively storing data in the memory of the downloading device or transferring the data directly to be programmed in the device and the selective routing of data is performed by the processor (col. 4 lines 30-45) in order to facilitate any necessary processing of the downloaded data. The control of the routing of the data by the processor implies that the data is routed automatically.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to selectively transfer data to the rechargeable device and the storage means of the charger in Averbuch et al. as evidenced by Shanahan because Averbuch et al. suggests a charger system for downloading data and transferring the data to a rechargeable device and Shanahan suggests downloading data from a remote source and selectively storing data in the memory of the downloading device or transferring the data directly to be programmed in the device in order to facilitate any necessary processing of the downloaded data.

Regarding claim 17, Averbuch et al. teaches the remote source is a server (104) and also teaches means for initiating transfer of the data from the server to the charging device by transmitting a request signal to the server (col. 2 lines 25-26).

Regarding claim 18, Averbuch et al. teaches means for initiating transfer of the data from the server to the charging device by transmitting a request signal to the server (col. 2 lines 25-26).

Regarding claim 19, Averbuch et al. teaches programming the charging device via the rechargeable electronic device to transmit the request signal to the server by setting a flag in the wireless device (col. 4 lines 54-60) and using this flag to determine when to download the software. The wireless device is also the charging device (col. 2 line 67-col. 3 line 2).

Claims 4 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Averbuch et al. U.S Patent 5,689,825 in view of Shanahan US Patent 6,496,692 and further in view of Reed U.S Patent 4,700,375.

Art Unit: 2635

Regarding claims 4 and 16, Averbuch et al. in view of Shanahan teaches a rechargeable portable device (col. 2 lines 10-17) but is silent on teaching the rechargeable device function as a remote control. Reed in an art related Battery charger and Data Transfer System teaches a rechargeable device functioning as a remote control (col. 5 lines 66-68), which is also a conventional practice.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the rechargeable device function as a remote control in Averbuch et al. in view of Shanahan as evidenced by Reed because Averbuch et al. in view of Shanahan suggests a rechargeable portable device and Reed teaches a rechargeable device functioning as a remote control in order to control other devices.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the



Art Unit: 2635

advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vernal U. Brown whose telephone number is 571-272-3060. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-7:00 Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Horabik can be reached on 571-272-3068. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Vernal Brown  
June 23, 2005



BRIAN ZIMMERMAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER